

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

RECEIVED  
USDC, CLERK, CHARLESTON, SC

2013 MAY -7 P 3:46

Crystal D. Anglin,

Plaintiff,

v.


Carolyn W. Colvin,  
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 6:12-1027-SB

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Crystal D. Anglin's action for judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security, pursuant to Section 205(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 405(g)), which denied the Plaintiff's claim for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income benefits under Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act. The record includes the report and recommendation ("R&R") of United States Magistrate Kevin F. McDonald, which was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a). In the R&R, which was filed on April 17, 2013, Magistrate Judge McDonald recommends that the Court affirm the Commissioner's final decision denying benefits.



The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the R&R to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the

Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, because no objections were filed, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Finding none, the Court hereby adopts the R&R (Entry 19) as the Order of the Court, and it is

**ORDERED** that the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is affirmed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



Sol Blatt, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

May 7, 2013  
Charleston, South Carolina

